

**REMARKS**

In an Office Action dated May 15, 2003, claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 28, all of the claims under consideration, were rejected. These rejections, as they apply to the newly amended claims, are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 28 were objected to for various informalities. The claims have been amended to correct these informalities. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 28 are therefore believed to be allowable.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fjaestad et al. (USPN 5,873,646). This rejection, as it applies to newly amended claim 1, is respectfully traversed.

Fjaestad fails to disclose or suggest the device described in claim 1. Fjaestad contains no teaching of an illumination system wherein in the first reflector structure, light is emitted at a first focal point, reflects from a first reflector portion to a second reflector portion and then converges substantially at a second focal point. On the contrary, in the device of Fjaestad, light reflects from only one reflector portion in the first reflector structure before converging at a second focal point. For this reason claim 1 is not anticipated by Fjaestad and is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 based on Fjaestad is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fjaestad et al. in view of Strobl et al. (USPN 5,414,600). Insofar as this rejection could apply to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

The above discussion concerning the deficiencies of Fjaestad is equally applicable here, and incorporated herein by reference. The Strobl et al. reference discloses a spherical retro-reflector, but otherwise fails to supply the above-noted deficiencies of Fjaestad. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fjaestad et al. in view of Strobl (USPN 6,356,700 B1), hereinafter "Strobl '700." Insofar as this rejection could apply to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

The above discussion concerning the deficiencies of Fjaestad is equally applicable here, and incorporated herein by reference.

Although the Strobl '700 patent discloses a tungsten filament lamp, it otherwise fails to supply the above-noted deficiencies of Fjaestad. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fjaestad et al. in view of Dorman (USPN 4,149,227). Insofar as this rejection could apply to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

The above discussion concerning the deficiencies of Fjaestad is equally applicable here, and incorporated herein by reference. Although Dorman discloses a coated reflector, it otherwise fails to supply the above-noted deficiencies of Fjaestad. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 9, 10, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg et al. (USPN 4,956,759) in view of Fjaestad et al.

Insofar as this rejection could apply to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

The above discussion concerning the deficiencies of Fjaestad is equally applicable here, and incorporated herein by reference.

The Goldenberg et al./Fjaestad et al. combination fails to suggest an illumination system wherein in the first reflector structure, light is emitted at a first focal point, reflects from a first reflector portion to a second reflector portion and then converges substantially at a second focal point.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection based on Goldenberg et al. and Fjaestad et al. is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldenberg et al. in view of Fjaestad et al. as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Junginger (USPN 3,772,506). Insofar as this rejection could apply to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed.

The above discussion concerning the deficiencies of the Goldenberg et al. and Fjaestad et al. combination is equally applicable here, and incorporated herein by reference. Although Junginger discloses a glass light pipe, it otherwise fails to supply any of the above-noted deficiencies of the Goldenberg et al./Fjaestad et al. combination.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested.


Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 28 are still generic to all of species 1-9.

Applicants additionally request consideration of new claims 34-37.

Applicants submit that new claims 34-37 encompass species represented by figures 1-7, and 9.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly requested.

| RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, |   |           |              |          |              |
|-------------------------|---|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| NAME AND<br>REG. NUMBER | George R. Repper, Registration No. 31,414   |           |              |          |              |
| SIGNATURE               |  |           |              | DATE     | 8-7-03       |
| Address                 | Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck<br>1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800                 |           |              |          |              |
| City                    | Washington  | State     | D.C.         | Zip Code | 20005        |
| Country                 | U.S.A.  | Telephone | 202-783-6040 | Fax      | 202-783-6031 |